



A R C H I T E C T U R E

752 108th Ave NE, Suite 203
Bellevue, WA 98004

Aug 3rd, 2021

Greg Johnson
(206) 727-8736

Greg.Johnson@seattle.gov

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections
700 Fifth Ave, Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Project: Project #3037857-LU, 106 NW 36TH ST
Subject: Response to Land Use MUP correction #1

Dear Glenda,

In response to the MUP Zoning review, we offer the following responses and revised MUP revision#1 package:

Corrections

1. Street Corner Massing.

Board Guidance 1a. The Board preferred Scheme 3 over the other design alternatives due to its residential-scaled massing response to both street frontages, its generous setback along the zone transition to the north, and the defined massing element at the street corner with shorter height and ground level patio space. (CS2-A-1. Sense of Place, CS2-C-1. Corner Sites, DC2-A-2. Reducing Perceived Mass).

The legibility of the corner mass has been reduced from EDG with the lack of connection between the base and upper floors at the street corner and the addition of a consistent roof line along 36th Avenue. The corten is an interesting feature, but it also seems to further confuse the corner design. Please address the corner design to regain its visual legibility within the design. A stronger massing connection with the base might be a good first step.

Response:

To bring back the legibility of the corner mass, changes are made:

1. A simply corner massing, clad in Corten steel, steps down at the top, and extends all the way to the street level to give a strong connection with the base. Together with the artistic roof trellis on top, they create a focal point and the hierarchy of the design. (CS2-A-1. Sense of Place, CS2-C-1. Corner Sites, DC2-A-2. Reducing Perceived Mass).

2. Level one retail sets back at the corner to add connection to the building above and provide more transparency and outdoor patio area.

2. Massing Simplification

EDG Guidance 1b. With its support for Scheme 3, the Board acknowledged public comment regarding the disjointed nature of the current massing design and endorsed simplification of the massing expression to clarify the concept to appear as more of a cohesive mass instead of an assembly of objects. The Board specifically identified the integration of the base and upper floors as a necessary action to simplify the mass (CS2-A-1. Sense of Place, DC2-B-1. Façade Composition).

The Board promoted the simplification of the massing design, including increasing cohesivity between the base and upper levels. There appears to be minimal integration of the base and upper floors in both materials and form. Additional connection between the base and upper floors would ideally occur at places like the residential entry, the blank sloped facade adjacent to grade between the residential entry and the commercial frontage, and at strategic points along the commercial frontage. Maybe a corten frame could be used to connect the commercial base and upper floors? Please refine the design to improve the connection between base and residential floors.

Additionally, an additional secondary massing element appears to have been added along the 36th Street frontage, which complicates a relatively simple massing design presented at EDG, of which the Board encouraged further simplification. If this design is intended to move forward, please provide a strong description of this design decision within the Recommendation packet. Include diagrams illustrating the design transition from the EDG massing design to the current design with the additional massing elements and a description of the intent for the massing change.

Response:

1. The façade along the 36th street has been simplified with straight up boxes instead of zigzag geometries, this change also provides some south facing balconies and more efficient layout for the south facing units.
2. The upper building massing and material have been brought down to the street level at both street corners and along 1st NW.
3. The SW additional massing was created due to the powerline setback at upper levels. Giving the hierarchy of the massing design, we have removed the Corten finish to give it a more uniformed appearance.
4. The rest of the facades are clad with two similar types of metal siding. (Light gray corrugated metal and dark gray standing seam), the subtle variations and vertical patter compliment the massing concept and visually reduce the column of the building. (DC2-A-2. Reducing Perceived Mass)

3. Driveway Departure and Parking Design

EDG Guidance 2a. The Board supported the design of zone transition on the north side of the site, including the generous building setback, the conceptual intent of a community garden, and the use of a dual-purpose

recreation space and parking area within the zone transition (CS2-D-1. Existing Development and Zoning, CS2-D-4. Massing Choices, PL3-B-1. Security and Privacy).

EDG Guidance 2c. The Board supported the conceptual design intent for zone transition area as an acceptable location for a dual parking area and recreation space. The Board emphasized that this area should be designed with sufficient ceiling height to serve as a recreation space. Safety and security of the space should be emphasized with high-visibility and sufficient lighting (CS2-D-1. Existing Development and Zoning, CS2-D-4. Massing Choices, PL2-B-2. Lighting for Safety, PL3-B-1. Security and Privacy, DC4-C-1. Functions).

At the EDG meeting, the Board supported the integration of amenity space into the parking design at the second level along with the initial support for the driveway departure. The plan set no longer appears to show any intent for amenity space in this location, which strengthened the departure request. If amenity space is no longer proposed, other design elements should be incorporated to strengthen the departure request. Without amenity space, the proposal could focus on minimizing visibility of the parking area and driveway from the street frontage and enhancing visibility of the residential entry design using building design and frontage design strategies. Incorporate other design elements such as:

1. Further reduction of driveway width at parking entrance. Maybe a driveway width departure request could be added to the MUP request to minimize the driveway width, especially for the small number of parking spaces on the second level.
2. The landscaping plan shows the intent for a seating area in the right of way outside of the residential entry. The design of this seating area should be used to visually shorten the width of the driveway entrance.
3. Reduce the visual width of the vehicle entrance along 1st Avenue NW by reducing the size of the open facade at grade adjacent to the residential entry. Combine this with an attractive form of screening along the 1st Ave. frontage.
4. Refine the residential entry design to improve its visual connection to the 1st Avenue facade and reduce its visual connection to the parking area..

Response:

1. Proposed revision has taken parking out on L2, leaving it as a plaza and a neighborhood event place for culture and art gatherings. A reduced driveway (12') provides the ease for loading for these events or overflow parking for other neighborhood activities.
2. NE corner drops down for a more grounded massing and provides better security.

4. Residential Entry

EDG Guidance 3.a.ii Move the primary residential entry to the 1st Avenue NW frontage and integrate it into the residential language of that façade. Replace the former entrance area on NW 36th St. with a use that will promote street activity and will allow for cohesivity with the commercial frontage (PL2-D-1. Design as Wayfinding, PL3-A-2. Ensemble of Elements).

Although the residential entry was moved to the 1st Avenue NW facade, and has a glassy appearance to be identifiable within the facade, the residential entry design should be pushed further to be integrated into the

overall 1st Avenue facade design. It does not appear to have any integration into the upper facade. Although the current design would be visible, it also bleeds into the parking area and appears to widen the appearance of the driveway and parking area.

Response:

Residential Entry was pushed in due to the grade change and to avoid an interior ramp. The revised design connects to the 1st avenue with a framed opening for eligibility and the open and transparent corner provides the community with a sense of security.

5. Scheduling your Recommendation Meeting. After you re-submit your corrected plans and have revised the design to fully respond to EDG guidance, a Design Review Recommendation meeting will be scheduled. Your re-submittal should include the following:

--Corrected plans and draft Design Review packet uploaded via the electronic project portal and to Hightail.

Once you have submitted all required materials, please email to alert me of the re-submittal and I will initiate scheduling the Recommendation meeting at the earliest available date (a minimum of six weeks). It is SDCI's expectation that you will continue to work with SDCI to further develop and refine the design in response to Board and staff reviews. If it is determined that the packet or design has not been responsive to guidance, it may result in postponement of the Recommendation meeting.

Response:

Noted.

6. Design Review - Packets.

a) Please upload the Draft Recommendation Packet to the Design Review website via the instructions found on the Design Review website. See Digital Submissions Instructions for assistance in uploading packets to the website.

b) You are responsible for working with the assigned Planner to develop and refine the packet in preparation for the Recommendation meeting.

c) You will receive an email from SDCI Design Review specifying the timing of the final hard copy packets to SDCI prior to the Board meeting. Packets are typically expected to arrive at SDCI approximately 2 weeks before the meeting date.

Response:

Noted.

7. Design Review - Materials. Please include color & materials info in the Recommendation packet as follows:

Provide high-quality photos of the actual materials board (not clipped photos of materials) in the REC packet.

Photos should be taken outside so that materials can be seen in natural daylight which more accurately conveys the material quality on a building. Photos taken in various angles; sunlight, & weather conditions are encouraged. Examples of the exact materials/colors installed on other completed projects with similar

context are encouraged. Identify projects which the Board may be familiar with or able to visit. Supplement the materials page of the REC proposal with links to the materials webpage on the manufacturer's website.

Provide specifications, scale elements, & specific product colors for materials so the Board can get a sense for what the material is like.

Response:

Noted.

Submit the standard 18" x 24" materials board as described in the Applicant Guide/Best Practices document posted on the Design Review website to the planner by mailing it (via USPS or Fedex) to the SMT, attention to the planner, for review and to be kept for City records. For less common materials or when the Board has previously given specific direction about the "character" of a material, the applicant may be required to provide advance physical samples mailed (via USPS or Fedex) to the SMT, attention to the planner.

8. Lighting Plan. Include an exterior lighting plan in the Recommendation packet and plan set.

Response:

Noted.

In the event that you require any further information or confirmation, please feel free to contact me at (214)9292801 or at Evette.yu@mza-us.com.

Yours truly,

EVETTE YU AIA, LEED^{AP}

Principal

MZA ARCHITECTURE

EVETTE.YU@MZA-US.COM

752 108th AVE NE, STE 203, BELLEVUE, WA 98004